

plaque designating the Star as a historic site in journalism.

The Star which now serves a broad section of the Midwest had its start in two rented rooms and in the mind of a brash young man from Indiana named William Rockhill Nelson. In a profession with a high casualty rate, the paper grew and prospered as it served the brawling city on the bluffs over the Missouri River.

It never backed away from a civic issue and in coming of age, it brought a new measure of excellence to American journalism. If it is a giant in its field then it is also true that it produced some giants of its own. I point to Roy A. Roberts who came to Washington 50 years ago as a young correspondent for the Star and who recently retired as chairman of the board. Is there a brighter name, Mr. Speaker, in all the annals of journalism?

The tradition of public service is being carried forward by Richard B. Fowler, president and editor, and by a devoted staff. As a public servant and a private citizen, I salute this great newspaper on its birthday.

U.S. POSITION IN LATIN AMERICA

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I am acutely aware of the serious damage likely to be done to our country's position in Latin America as the result of yesterday's oracular foreign policy utterance.

Had the identical indictment of U.S. actions in Santo Domingo emanated from Radio Havana, I would have called John Chancellor this morning at the Voice of America to ask that an early response be broadcast throughout the hemisphere in order to set the record straight on this issue. Unfortunately, however, the Voice of America is neither equipped nor authorized to cope with criticisms of U.S. foreign policy issued by high ranking officials of our own country.

The passion for anonymity seems to be a disappearing virtue among too many of our highly placed public figures. Instead, we have seen develop a passion for notoriety—a willingness, if not a compulsion, to forgo the channels of responsible policy dissent in favor of headlines or books sales. Thus, close advisers to former Presidents and incumbent authorities on foreign affairs have taken to washing policy linens in public to the detriment of the country and to the delight of enemy propagandists.

Yet, the world—friends and foes alike—are not aware that these oracles and derogators of their own country's policies speak for themselves alone and not for the majority of their countrymen. The American people overwhelmingly support President Johnson's actions in Santo Domingo and fully understand that had he not so acted, firmly and expeditiously, not only would American lives have been lost, but that, more than likely, we would have been confronted

with another Castro-styled Communist base in the Caribbean.

In order that the impression presented to the world by the most recent of these criticisms be refuted, I am requesting a special order for Thursday next so that I may discuss more thoroughly the position of the United States in the recent Dominican crisis.

RESERVE-GUARD MERGER

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, reports continue to reach the committees of Congress that the Defense Department's insistence upon the Reserve-Guard merger is being carried on despite repeated rejections of the proposal by the Congress. I must respectfully submit that this insistence is resulting in detriment to the national preparedness program.

It would seem incredible to me that the Department would permit rigid adherence to a one-plan preparedness program insofar as the Reserve components are concerned. Nevertheless, this is what the evidence indicates.

Had the Defense Department on last December 12 put into operation a major program to increase manning levels for, intensified training of, and issuance of equipment to, selected units of the Army Reserve and Army National Guard, all of these selected units would now be fully combat ready and available for prompt call to Federal service, excepting, of course, those units which might now be answering the call of their respective Governors to maintain order.

If such an improved readiness program had been initiated on May 15 when the Secretary of Defense agreed publicly that a Reserve-Guard merger could not be accomplished without specific authority from the Congress, selected units would now be ready 120 days after the aforesaid date.

If this selected unit readiness program had been underway promptly when the House Armed Services Committee, on August 12, announced its rejection of the Reserve-Guard merger plan—after this improved selected unit readiness program had been advanced before the committee in public hearings—we would be a long way toward the goal for the Reserves which we have been told is important to national security.

Yet, the Defense Department has allowed every such opportunity to go by without taking positive steps to authorize the Reserve Forces units which may be called up to bolster military services for the crisis in southeast Asia, and I am told that restrictions on recruiting, training and equipment continue.

This apparently inflexible determination to carry forward a Guard-Reserve merger program without consideration or utilization of alternative proposals must be accepted, I believe, as resulting in deference to the Nation's national security program.

The Congress is now ready for final action on the fiscal year 1966 defense appropriation bill. That bill further

spells out the desire of Congress for both the Guard and the Reserve to be maintained at adequate strength levels. Without a merger obviously now the alternative plan to a Guard-Reserve merger must be put into effect. Congress has made it clear through the language of the defense appropriation bill that it does not want the Reserve to be starved out. If a realistic and cooperative response is to be had from the Department of Defense, vigorous training must now be undertaken for both. Very possibly this will result in a need for additional money. I think every action taken by Congress during the current session would indicate an exception that a realistic training program be carried on and that a request for supplemental funds be initiated if needed. The support given by Congress to all phases of the defense program will, I am certain, convince the Department we are prepared to provide funds for the Reserve and the Guard. In other words, if more money is needed, we want the Department to ask for it.

I am calling these matters to the attention of the Secretary of Defense because I simply cannot believe that he is aware of the great lengths to which merger proponents have gone in their unprecedented pressure campaigns. This pressure has been exerted in Congress, and from top to bottom in the Department of Defense and in the Reserve components. In the latter these tactics have resulted in loss of morale, loss of personnel, and loss of effectiveness. Certainly it is now time to call a halt to these campaigns and to exert full effort to the training and equipping of needed units in both the Guard and the Reserve. I respectfully urge that the DOD staff take advantage of the alternative proposals which are known to be available and which can be equally effective, and which have so long been neglected.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(Mr. BURLERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURLERSON. Mr. Speaker, usually hindsight is about 20-20. It seems this practice is more often related to politics and football, although the Monday morning quarterback has his say a little sooner than the politician. And too, it more often, if not always, follows defeat.

It was an amazing thing which occurred in the Senate on yesterday when the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], commented on the recent U.S. action in the Dominican Republic.

The Senator referred to the action of sending troops to the Dominican Republic as a grievous mistake characterized "initially by overtimidity and subsequently by overreaction."

Mr. Speaker, one of the most grievous mistakes which has characterized our Government's policies since the end of

September 16, 1965

World War II has been overtimidity, but not of the kind and character referred to by the Senator from Arkansas. A courageous President Kennedy was not timid when he forced offensive missiles out of Cuba, and we can thank God that we have President Johnson, who was not timid about the action in the Dominican Republic and who is not timid in South Vietnam.

It seems to me the concern of everyone should be to see that success in the Dominican Republic is assured and not by timidity allow the accomplishment there to erode and permit forces inimical to the United States and the Western Hemisphere to take over. This should be the primary concern and not that which these Members of the other body expressed yesterday about whether, first, there was danger to American personnel in the Dominican Republic and, second, whether it was about to be taken over by Communist forces.

As to the danger to American personnel, I have an idea that it was considerably more dangerous to the able Ambassador, Tapley Bennett, who made his telephonic report from under his desk in the American Embassy while bullets were flying over the top, than sitting in the marble halls of this Congress.

Would these Members of Congress wait until a Communist takeover had been accomplished to have done anything at all, and then what would they have done?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that we can be thankful we have a President who did not wait for the "mañana," which might never have arrived.

I compliment the Organization of American States on their subsequent efforts in the Dominican Republic to resolve this highly explosive situation, but to have waited for an initial decision from them would in all likelihood, have been too late.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, long an advocate of lavish foreign aid, seems worried by the methods used to protect our position in the Dominican Republic and fears we have wounded feelings in Latin America. Well, my colleagues, if our actions there are questioned and criticized, we have gained little friendship at an exceedingly heavy cost. Contrarily, his comments invite this very attitude.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to question the motives of anyone but there is no need to pretend that the discussion on the Senate floor yesterday is, indeed, strange and difficult to understand. Apparently, at the core of the Senator's concern with our policy and course of action in the Dominican Republic and in general policy as well, is that we may be interfering with a truly revolutionary movement of democratic people.

Mr. Speaker, it was called that in Cuba in its takeover. Conditions have been thusly described in every instance of Communist attempts to overthrow governments.

Talk about timidity. It was not a timid action our President exercised in the Dominican Republic, and I say again, the timidity which seems to have influenced our policies following the end of World War II is terribly dangerous simply be-

cause our adversaries in this world may be led to doubt our courage, our resolve, and determination to defend freedom.

Mr. Speaker, with friends like these who speak so critically on this matter, the administration needs no enemies and, as to that matter, neither does our country.

PETER J. CROTTY, OF BUFFALO, N.Y.

(Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay my deepest respect to a most gracious man, a man who has literally changed the political map of the State of New York.

Peter J. Crotty, who recently retired as Democratic chairman of Erie County, N.Y., has made his mark for generations to come on our Empire State. For, in a brief span of 10 years, he has changed Erie County from a bastion of Republican strength to a now healthy, Democratic stronghold.

In 1934, Erie County had 50,000 more registered Republicans than Democrats. Today, Democrats exceed Republicans by 47,000. In the city of Buffalo, the Democrats now have a registration figure of 55,000 over the Republicans. In 1954, when Mr. Crotty became Democratic county chairman the Democrats only had a microscopic lead of 1,300. In 1954 there were no Democratic Congressmen in Erie County—today there are two. In that year there was no Democratic State senators, today there are three. Also, in 1954 there were only two Democratic assemblymen, today seven out of eight assemblymen are Democrats. Furthermore, there are now numerous other Democratic officeholders in the city of Buffalo.

This remarkable upsurge just did not happen, it took leadership and hard work. Peter J. Crotty provided both in the highest degree.

No one can challenge his greatness and what he has achieved for the Democratic Party. For the past 11 years, he has played a major roll in the selection of Presidents of the United States, as well as county supervisors.

He leaves behind him a legacy of outstanding achievements, and his superior leadership qualities will long be remembered. He has an intimate knowledge of government problems in the Erie County area which will be sorely missed. His vast legislative experience and guidance plus his impeccable personal integrity will not be forgotten nor will his long dedication to the principles of honest and efficient government.

This charming man, my close friend, will be missed by all of us in the State of New York.

FAMILIES IN CIVIL SERVICE

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, there appeared an article by Jerry Klutts in which some state-

ments were attributed to me on the question of civil servants, the statement having been made the other day on the floor of the House.

I should like to state that everything Mr. Klutts states constitutes a good reporting job. I am responsible for everything he has quoted me as saying.

But when he gets into the realm of poetic license, and makes a statement such as the following:

DENT also pointed an accusing finger at civil servants for not getting married and having families.

I should like to point out that I never revise my remarks in the RECORD and the remarks are there for all to see.

I do not remember saying anything about whether they get married or do not get married, and whether they have families or not.

What I did allude to was where they have families, they try to get them all on civil service.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES IS COLLECTING TRADING STAMPS

(Mr. RESNICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, on September 10, at the invitation of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff], I attended a meeting in New York City at which the subject of trading stamps was discussed, with the purpose of determining whether or not they contribute to consumer costs. During the course of these discussions, the representative of one of the large nationwide car rental organizations asked to be heard. This gentleman stated that it was the policy of his company to give trading stamps to people who rent its cars. Mr. Wolff asked him whether his company did business with the U.S. Government. The car rental executive said he did. Then he said something which, I confess, absolutely astounded me, and which I am sure will surprise many other gentlemen in this distinguished room today. He revealed the fact that the U.S. Government saves trading stamps. When Government employees rent automobiles from this particular company, the company sends the stamps to a Government agency—the particular agency was not specified—and these stamps are then exchanged for gifts which are then distributed, we are told, to veterans' hospitals.

I must confess that I was appalled by the revelation that the U.S. Government has joined the shoppers of America in collecting trading stamps. I was even so crass as to wonder why the Bureau of the Budget or the General Accounting Office did not insist upon price reductions in car rental instead of taking the stamps.

I was even beset by visions of busy bureaucrats, actively at work in an underground office in downtown Washington, tearing off and mailing in all the box tops of the cereal packages consumed by Government personnel, filling out and mailing in all the 2-cents-off coupons on

Government-consumed detergent and coffee, trying to balance the books in the chocolate pudding account after having bought three boxes and gotten one free, and, finally, fighting over the question of whose name would be filled out on the sweepstake ticket that would be sent back to the cigarette company for a 2-week, all-expense-paid trip to Paris.

Later on, however, when cool reason returned, I realized that this system had merit. That the Government should demand trading stamps with all its purchases from all suppliers, since a quick check revealed that the trading stamps obtained with Government purchases every year would almost be enough to balance the budget. And by insisting upon trading stamps with our imports we would go a long way toward assisting the Treasury Department in overcoming the balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of foolish talk about Government rubber-stamps. I think it is about time we gave some serious thought to Government trading stamps. It is not only ludicrous but inexcusable for the Government to take trading stamps with its purchases from private companies. I am sure it is also costly, because dealers do not get stamps for nothing; they pay for them. And this cost is passed along to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

I am not even raising the question of who really gets the gifts the Government is saving for, and whether or not any sophisticated form of payola is involved. That is not the main point. The real issue is whether Government money is being spent efficiently—are we getting 100 cents worth for every dollar spent, as President Johnson has demanded—or is some of it being needlessly and wastefully frittered away to support promotion gimmicks.

CHALLENGE TO MISSISSIPPI REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today, outside of the Capitol, sitting in silent vigil, are a large number of courageous citizens from the State of Mississippi who have come to Washington because tomorrow the House will consider the challenge to the seating of the Mississippi Members of Congress.

The Committee on House Administration will, I understand, tomorrow bring to the floor a resolution to dismiss the election contests against the five Members. The resolution also states that the five Members "are entitled to their seats as Representatives of said districts and State."

At this time I should like to say to Members of the House that I believe this is one of the most crucial issues which has ever come before us.

The question is whether or not the illegal and discriminatory practices of the State of Mississippi are to be condoned and validated. I certainly hope that all Members of the House will look at the facts of brutality, terror, intimi-

dation, and murder which have existed and persisted throughout the years in Mississippi. The challenge is based upon the deliberate and unconstitutional disenfranchisement of 43 percent of the population in the 1964 congressional elections. This renders those elections invalid.

Mr. Speaker, the 19-to-5 majority report of the committee must be opposed and the resolution defeated.

The Subcommittee on Elections held 3 hours of closed hearings to which only subcommittee members, contestants, contestees, and counsel were admitted. It limited testimony to the single issue of whether or not the contestants had standing to bring the statutory challenge.

Nevertheless, the committee report finds that the congressional elections of 1964 were constitutional and valid.

The committee also bases its recommendation on the proposition that the election result would have been the same even if disenfranchised citizens had voted.

By stating "the action recommended by this committee should not be interpreted as condoning any disenfranchisement of any voters in the 1964 elections or in previous elections," the committee admits the disenfranchisement of Negro citizens.

This is the most incredible barrier ever raised to the constitutional right to vote. It means that no election can be challenged as unconstitutional unless the challenging party can prove that enough voters were disenfranchised to alter the election result. If this report is adopted, it will serve to bar any and all future challenges alleging disenfranchisement. It will establish the rule that the disenfranchised minority or majority have no right to challenge an election without proof that they would have changed its outcome.

The committee has said nothing which gives any real assurance for future elections. It only expresses its confidence that future violations of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 will be investigated by the House.

This report gives nothing less than a green light to present efforts by the State of Mississippi to undermine the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot condone the elections of U.S. Representatives who gained their seats through an unconstitutional election. The proposed resolution must be rejected.

CHALLENGE TO MISSISSIPPI REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. BURTON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] and to state again that the issue which will be before the House tomorrow will be one of great importance. I share the concern of so many that the elections held in the State of Mississippi last year were not in conformity with

the Federal constitutional rights of the citizens of that State.

I truly hope that the Members of this body will reject the recommendation of the Committee on House Administration tomorrow when that matter is before us.

HOME RULE—HATCH ACT

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a fundamental issue complicating consideration of home rule for the District of Columbia is that of protection of the Federal employee system under the Hatch Act.

Throughout the debate on home rule in recent years I have insisted that the principle of a nonpartisan, politically insulated Federal employee system must be retained.

Home rule for the Nation's Capital, if it is to be obtained at the expense of this principle, would be a high price indeed for the people of this country. Yet, the administration-supported home rule proposal endangers, if it does not in fact sacrifice, this principle.

Both the administration-backed Senate home rule bill and that sponsored by Congressman Multer provide an exemption from Hatch Act provisions for Federal employees living in the District of Columbia.

The immediate result of enactment of a home rule bill containing this provision would be to establish an unfair double standard for application of the Hatch Act among Federal employees.

While Federal employees living in the District would be exempted from the law's prohibition against political partisanship, millions of other Federal workers throughout the country would still be restrained and under sanction regarding political activities.

It is obvious that the long-range result of this double standard would be, in terms of maintenance of the Hatch Act. A widespread breakdown of the public's and the Federal employee's protection under the Hatch Act would occur. And from this opening wedge we would witness a return to the days of the spoils system in Federal employment which preceded passage of the Hatch Act.

Home rule proponents argue that the residents of the District who are Federal employees should be given equal rights in the governing of their own municipal affairs. It is one thing to argue in behalf of such equal rights, but it is quite something else to extend special privileges of District Federal employees in order to accomplish these rights.

This is an issue which home rule supporters obviously seek to avoid. Yet it is an issue which affects not the residents of the District of Columbia alone, but the American people as a whole. It is their Federal employee system which is being sacrificed, unless provision is made to protect and maintain the integrity of the Hatch Act under a District home rule government.

As I have stated, home rule for the District would be dearly purchased if, in order to obtain it, the country must re-

September 16, 1965

vert to the days of spoils system politics. Already we have seen the steady deterioration of Hatch Act protection under the assaults of overzealous political party organizers. This trend must be reversed if the country is to continue to enjoy a high standard of service among its millions of Federal employees.

But enactment of home rule for the District, under the terms of the pending administration-supported bills, would in fact accelerate and aggravate the deterioration of Hatch Act protection. I therefore ask and implore all Members of this House to support my efforts to help reverse the trend of recent years regarding breakdown of Hatch Act coverage of Federal employees—and to study carefully the ramifications of de-Hatching Federal workers in the District while yet applying the law to those in our own congressional districts and throughout the country.

THE LATE DR. RALPH C. SMEDLEY

(Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to report to the House the recent death of Dr. Ralph C. Smedley, who was the founder of Toastmasters International. Dr. Smedley was 87 years of age when he passed away. He has been a constituent of mine for many years.

Dr. Smedley organized the original Toastmasters Club in Santa Ana, Calif., in 1924. The movement rapidly spread to other cities and Dr. Smedley resigned as director of the YMCA to devote full time to Toastmasters International. He received an honorary degree of L.H.D., doctor of humane letters, from Illinois Wesleyan University. During his lifetime a million men received training in the Toastmasters' organization and there are currently some 80,000 members of Toastmasters International in more than 3,600 clubs in 50 countries and territories throughout the free world. Many parks and playgrounds have been named and dedicated to his honor.

Dr. Smedley was author of numerous books in the fields of public speaking and parliamentary procedure. Among his best known are "The Amateur Chairman," "Speech Evaluation," "Basic Training," "The Voice of the Speaker," "The Great Toastmaster," and "The Story of Toastmasters."

I wish to express my personal gratitude for the long record of dedicated service in his chosen field and hope that his great work will be carried on throughout the years to come.

TEXTBOOKS SHOULD BE WRITTEN BY EDUCATORS NOT BUREAUCRATS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reports are being circulated around Washington that the Federal Government is preparing a campaign to rewrite the history books

used in our educational system. This is without a doubt one of the most appalling disclosures that I have heard during my tenure in the House of Representatives.

It is my understanding that the drive to rewrite the textbooks is under the auspices of the Community Relations Service, an agency created by the 1964 Civil Rights Act to help mediate racial disputes. It is the feeling within this agency that the history books do not give fair treatment to the Negro. This may or may not be true; but the issue involved here is not one of civil rights, it is one of censorship rights.

Mr. Speaker, let me at the very outset make it clear that I do not vacate my position of equal justice for all Americans under our civil rights program. I have always supported civil rights legislation, and certainly the goal of giving the Negro his rightful place in history books is commendable.

Again, I say the real issue is not one of civil rights but one of censorship rights. In other words, should the responsibility of writing, or rewriting textbooks used by our children remain with qualified educators, free of Federal influence; or should it be handled by the Federal Government? We are headed toward the latter if we let the Community Relations Service get away with this proposed project—for then we will have given the Office of Education a precedent to accelerate its plans for federally written textbooks and a federally controlled curriculum.

Mr. Speaker, I have considerable doubt as to whether or not the Community Relations Service has the legal right to perform the function of rewriting textbooks to be used by our schoolchildren. I support the idea for which the Service was created—that being to provide assistance to communities and persons in settling racial disputes—nothing more. I strongly oppose any attempt by the Federal Government to dictate what will and what will not be in our textbooks because, in my opinion, this is not just a step down the road to a dictatorship, it is a giant's leap down that very road.

In a confidential memorandum, the Community Relations Service suggests:

Once the educational and informational campaign is solidly underway, we should conduct a systematic effort to contact all publishers and school boards to encourage their publication and adoption of textbooks conforming to established standards.

The term, Mr. Speaker, "established standards" is a euphemistic way of saying it is going to set standards and censor the reading materials of our school system. It is just as simple as that.

This Federal control over our schools was one of the main reasons that I had qualms about Federal aid to education and also was the reasoning behind my decision to introduce the Pelly bill which would give the schools the aid that was needed without the Federal controls. This would be accomplished by returning to each State a portion of the amount its citizens pay in income taxes. Each State under my bill would determine how these funds would be spent for education. There would be no strings at all.

If the American people fully realized what Federal controls are planned for their schools, I am more than sure that we would hear one of the greatest outcries of protest and disapproval from the grassroots ever to echo in the Halls of Congress.

I need not remind my colleagues that when a dictator comes to power, the very first step he must take to consolidate that power is to capture the minds of the young—history presents this case in great depth. How easy it can be when the Federal or Central Government controls the writing and censorship of textbooks.

The Congress must investigate the facts before them—including the proposal to influence the contents of school textbooks. I am sure this is what the American people would demand.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN SANTO DOMINGO

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was quite interested when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLISON], took the floor a few moments ago to discuss our foreign policy in Santo Domingo. Much of what the gentleman from Texas said I agree with.

The thing which disturbs me is that I read in the newspapers that the remarks made by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations had been submitted to the White House, prior to delivery and the result is there is considerable confusion in the Nation as to what is our foreign policy.

I believe it is quite important that this matter be clarified. Does the administration agree with Senator FULBRIGHT? What is the present version of our foreign policy in Santo Domingo? I hope that the administration will clarify this very serious and important matter.

CHALLENGE TO MISSISSIPPI REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the Committee on House Administration will bring out the Mississippi matter tomorrow with a recommendation of dismissal. I deplore the haste with which this dismissal is being proposed.

This motion ignores many, many questions which have been raised about the legality of the elections which brought the Mississippi Members here. The pattern of the denial of the right to vote in Mississippi has been evidenced by the report and the hearings of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, by testimony taken in connection with the challenge, and by hearings on the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and other information available to the Congress.

I do not feel that the Committee on House Administration has given adequate consideration to the challenge. I would certainly urge all Members to be present